PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAI	MINING AUTHORIT	Y	PC1	Γ	٧
CABINET HIRSCH & ASSOCIES 58 Avenue Marceau F-75008 Paris FRANCE AMIT 2005		WRITTEN OPINION (PCT Rule 66) Vate of mailing day/month/year) 02/08/2005			
Applicant's or agent's file reference 21957PC SUD			REPLY DUE within 2 / 00 months/days from the above date of mailing		
International application No.	International filing date	(day/month/year)	Priority date (day	/month/year)	
PCT/EP03/15034	31/12/2003		31/12/2003	3	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC					
	F01D17/16				
Applicant					-
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL	L, INC				
1. This written opinion is the first drawn up by this International Preliminary Examining Authority. 2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: I X Basis of the opinion II Priority III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability IV Lack of unity of invention V X Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement VI Certain documents cited VII Certain defects in the international application VIII Certain observations on the international application VIII See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d). By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8. Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rules 66.4. For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments, see Rule 66.6. Also For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.					
If no reply is filed, the international pre 4. The final date by which the international		port will be established	on the basis of this	opinion.	1 2 3
examination report must be established a	secording to Rule 69.2 is	30/04	/2006	Wisches Patental	71,2
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/		Authorized officer		3	Topa
European Patent Office, P.B. 58 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Netherl: Tel.: (+31-70) 340-2040 Fax: (+31-70) 340-3016	ands	Examiner Formalities officer (incl. extension of tim Tel. (+49-89) 2399 2			918/10
Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (march 2	002)			Office europee	w-

. i. Basis of the opinion

- 1. The basis of this written opinion is the application as originally filed.
- V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability
- In light of the documents cited in the international search report, it is considered that the
 invention as defined in at least some of the claims does not appear to meet the
 criteria mentioned in Article 33(1) PCT, i.e. does not appear to be novel and/or to involve
 an inventive step (see international search report, in particular the documents cited X
 and/or Y and corresponding claims references).
- 2. If amendments are filed, the applicant should comply with the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT and indicate the basis of the amendments in the documents of the application as originally filed (Article 34 (2) (b) PCT) otherwise these amendments may not be taken into consideration for the establishment of the international preliminary examination report. The attention of the applicant is drawn to the fact that if the application contains an unnecessary plurality of independent claims, no examination of any of the claims will be carried out.
- NB: Should the applicant decide to request detailed substantive examination, then an international preliminary examination report will normally be established directly. Exceptionally the examiner may draw up a second written opinion, should this be explicitly requested.